

REMARKS

Claims 12, 14, 18, 22, and 23 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 19-21 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, and 24-26 are pending.

The rejection of claims 1-11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, and 24-26 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, is respectfully traversed. First, that the specification described both direct and indirect transitions to an invalid state, as noted on page 3 of the Office Action, does not preclude applicants from limiting their claim to require that there be multiple direct transitions to the invalid state, regardless of whether or not indirect paths also exist. Support for the previous amendment is found, without limitation, at page 27, lines 5-11, which state clearly that in an embodiment the arrow 614 represents multiple transitions to the invalid state 606. That those paths are direct is apparent from Figure 6, which shows no intervening valid or invalid state. Further support is found, without limitation, in the pseudo-code at page 29, line 3 – page 30, line 24 (various transitions indicated by “enter(discard_state)”), and in the accompanying discussion at page 30, lines 32-34, page 31 lines 10-32, and page 32, lines 12-23.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, and 24-26 under 35 USC 103(a).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claims 1, 19, 20, and 21, the Office Action acknowledges that I’Anson, Park, and Shanklin do not teach a “plurality of invalid transitions being direct transitions from the first state to the invalid state,” as recited in 1, 19, 20, and 21. The Office Action cites Mahajan to satisfy the foregoing element, but Mahajan teaches direct transitions to a *valid* (i.e., the “forwarding”) state. Mahajan, col. 5, line 53 – col. 6, line 8. Furthermore, none of the references teaches “in the event it is determined by applying the plurality of regular expressions to the packet that the packet is associated with a particular one of the plurality of invalid transitions, taking a corresponding responsive action associated specifically with the particular one of the plurality of invalid transitions,” as recited in claims 1, 19, 20, and 21. Support for the amendment may be found, without limitation, in the pseudo-code at page 29, line 3 – page 30, line 24, and in the accompanying discussion at page 30, lines 32-34, page 31 lines 10-32, and page 32, lines 12-23 (e.g., responsive actions

“doerror(FINGER_CDK_BACKDOOR)”, “doerror(FINGER_SEARCH_REQUEST)”, etc.
done, depending on which regular expression associated with an invalid transition is matched.

Claims 2-11, 13, 15-17, and 24-26 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/19/2007

William J. James
William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014